

### REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 19, 34, and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-18, 27-33, 35/9-10, 35/33 have been canceled. Claims 19-26, 34, 35/34 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 19, 22, 34, and 35/34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyake et al. (US 5,428,472). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 34 recite, *inter alia*, “a plurality of grating regions, each of the grating regions having a grating with a ... pitch ..., wherein at least one of said plurality of grating regions has a variable pitch” (emphasis added). Miyake et al. does not teach or suggest this limitation. Miyake et al. discloses that “grating pitches  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are respectively equal to the sum of the groove width  $L$  and land width  $M$ .” Col. 9, ln. 12-14. In Miyake et al., multiple grating regions may have different pitches, but each region has a fixed pitch. There is no variable pitch. Since Miyake et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 19 and 34, claims 19 and 34 are not anticipated by Miyake et al. Claim 22 depends from claim 19 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claim 35/34 depends from claim 34 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 19, 22, 34, and 35/34 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kadowaki et al. (US 6,898,169). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, “a plurality of grating regions, each of the grating regions having a grating with a prescribed pitch ..., wherein at least one of said

plurality of grating regions has a variable pitch" (emphasis added). Kadowaki et al. does not teach or suggest this limitation. Kadowaki et al. discloses "the diffraction grating 61 is produced in the following manner: a master of the diffraction grating 61 is prepared, and then polyolefin resin is molded by using the master as a die." Col. 8, ln. 46-49. In Kadowaki et al., multiple grating regions may have different pitches, but each region has a fixed pitch. There is no variable pitch. Since Kadowaki et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claim 19 are not anticipated by Kadowaki et al. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyake et al. in view of Shiono et al. (US 5,742,433). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 20 and 23-24 depend from claim 19 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 20 and 23-24 be withdrawn.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadowaki et al. in view of Shiono et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 21 depends from claim 19 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyake et al. in view of Iwatsuka et al. (US 5,245,471). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 25-26 depend from claim 19 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 25-26 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants